

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 5-10 are cancelled. Claims 1-4 and 11-12 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 2-4 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0092021) in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,372). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended to call for features previously recited in claim 3. No new matter has been added by these changes.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

the least two signal processing mechanisms simultaneously performing compressive coding processing to the television signal delivered over the desired channel such that each one of the least two signal processing mechanisms performs compressive coding processing at a respective compression rate that is different than that at which any other of the least two signal processing mechanisms performs compressive coding processing.

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Yap nor the relied on sections of Kim disclose or suggest simultaneously performing compressive coding processing to a television signal such that each signal processing mechanisms perform compressive

coding processing at a respective compression rate that is different than that at which any other of the signal processing mechanisms performs compressive coding processing.

Rather, such sections of Yap merely describe that it may be advantageous to compress or modify compression parameters to improve the storage efficiency on removable media. (See ¶ [0076].) These sections are not concerned with simultaneously compressing at different compression rates, and these sections are not concerned with modifying compression parameters to simultaneously compress at different compression rates.

The relied on sections of Kim do not overcome the deficiencies of the relied on sections of Yap.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that neither the relied on sections of Yap nor the relied on sections of Kim, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the combination set out in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of the references.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and therefore each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 11 recites:

a first signal processing mechanism and a second signal processing mechanism for performing respective predetermined processing on a received television signal supplied thereto, the first signal processing mechanism performing a first predetermined processing and the second signal processing mechanism performing a second predetermined processing which is different than the first predetermined processing;

...

said first predetermined processing including compressive coding at a first compression rate and said second predetermined processing including compressive

coding at a second compression rate which is different than the first compression rate.

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Yap nor the relied on sections of Kim disclose or suggest first predetermined processing including compressive coding at a first compression rate and second predetermined processing including compressive coding at a second compression rate which is different than the first compression rate.

Rather, such sections of Yap merely describe that it may be advantageous to compress or modify compression parameters to improve the storage efficiency on removable media. (See ¶ [0076].) These sections are not concerned with compressing at a first compression rate and at a second compression rate which is different than the first compression rate, and these sections are not concerned with modifying compression parameters to compress at a first compression rate and at a second compression rate which is different than the first compression rate.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that neither the relied on sections of Yap nor the relied on sections of Kim, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the combination set out in claim 11. Claim 11 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claim 12 calls for features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1 and therefore is patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of Yap and Kim for at least the reasons set out above regarding claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending

claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Lawrence
E. Russ/
Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

1126315_3.09C